

### REMARKS

The non-final Office Action rejects claims 1-16, 18-40, 42, and 44-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by WIN et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,142); and rejects claims 17 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WIN in view of COLEY et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,826,014). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections with respect to the claims as currently presented.<sup>1</sup>

By the present amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 13, 19, 31, 32, 34, and 44 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-42 and 44-50 remain pending.

I. Claims 1-16, 18-40, 42, and 44-50 are not anticipated by WIN under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16, 18-40, 42, and 44-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by WIN. Applicants respectfully submit that WIN does not anticipate claims 1-16, 18-40, 42, and 44-50.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single reference disclose every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. WIN does not disclose the combination of features recited in claims 1-16, 18-40, 42, and 44-50.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Office Action's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

For example, amended claim 1 recites a method for accessing resources on a private network via an intermediary server, said method comprising (a) receiving a login request from a user for access to the intermediary server that is outside the private network; (b) authenticating the user; (c) subsequently receiving a resource request from the user at the intermediary server, the resource request requesting a particular operation with respect to a resource from the private network; (d) obtaining access privileges for the user; (e) determining whether the access privileges for the user permit the user to perform the particular operation at the private network; and (f) preventing performance of the particular operation at the private network such that a response to the resource request is not had when said determining (e) determines that the access privileges for the user do not permit the user to perform the particular operation at the private network. WIN does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, WIN does not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action suggests Access Server 106 of WIN corresponds to the intermediary server recited in claim 1, citing to col. 6, lines 6-24 and col. 9, lines 45-67 (p. 2, Office Action). At col. 6, lines 6-24, WIN discloses a system 2 that enables Users to log-in to the system and responds when the Users successfully logs into the system and when the Users fail to log-in. However, the cited passage in WIN does not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in claim 1.

At col. 9, lines 45-67, WIN discloses Access Server 106 and its operation with respect to login and authentication. However, Applicants submit that login and/or authentication with respect to Access Server 106 of WIN does not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in amended claim 1.

At col. 4, lines 60-63, WIN discloses:

For example, Registry Server 108 may be part of a secure Intranet that is protected using a firewall 118, and *Access Server 106 may be located on an extranet for access by user inside and outside the enterprise [italics added for emphasis]*.

The extranet is a private network. Because Access Server 106 is located on the extranet, Access Server 106 is also located within the private network. Thus, logging into Access Server 106 of WIN does not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in amended claim 1. In fact, Access Server 106 of WIN, by its virtue of being located within the private network, teaches away from an intermediary server that is outside the private network.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by WIN.

Claims 2-16 and 18 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by WIN for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the base independent claims are sufficient to overcome the Office Action's rejections of all claims dependent therefrom, Applicants' silence as to the Office Action's assertions with respect to dependent claims is not a concession by Applicants to the Office Action's assertions as to these claims, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions in the future.

Independent claim 19, as amended, recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 19 is not anticipated by WIN for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 20-30 depend from claim 19. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by WIN for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 19.

Amended claim 31 recites an intermediary server system, comprising a web server that receives requests for resources from client machines via a network, the web server being outside of a private network; a protocol handler operatively connected to said web server, said protocol handler receives the requests for resources, modifies the requests to be directed to appropriate remote servers via the private network, and forwards the modified requests for resources to the appropriate remote servers; a content transformer operatively connected to said protocol handler, said content transformer receives the resources supplied by the appropriate remote servers in response to the modified requests and modifies the resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to said intermediary server system instead of remote servers; and an authentication manager that is located outside the private network and manages access by said client devices to resources on the private network. WIN does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, WIN does not disclose or suggest an authentication manager that is located outside the private network and manages access by said client devices to resources on the private network, as recited in amended claim 31.

The Office Action suggests Access Server 106, Authentication Client Module, Access Menu Module, and/or Registry Server 108 of WIN corresponds to the authentication manager recited in claim 1, citing to col. 6, lines 49-51 and col. 9, lines 45-67 (p. 10, Office Action). At col. 6, lines 47-52, WIN discloses:

Access Server stores a log-in page, Authentication Client Module and Access Menu Module. The Authentication Client Module authenticates a user by verifying the name and password with the Registry Server 108. If the name and password are correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user's roles from the Registry Server 108.

However, Authentication Client Module and Access Menu Modules are stored in Access Server, which is located inside a private network, as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Registry Server 108 is part of a secure Intranet (see col. 4, lines 60-63 of WIN), and thus, is within the private network. Accordingly, the cited passage in WIN does not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in claim 1.

At col. 9, lines 45-67, WIN discloses Access Server 106 and its operation with respect to login and authentication. However, for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, the login and/or authentication with respect to Access Server 106 of WIN do not disclose or suggest receiving a login request from a user for access to an intermediary server that is outside the private network, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 31 is not anticipated by WIN.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 31. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by WIN for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 31.

Independent claims 34 and 44 recite features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 34 and 44 are not anticipated by WIN for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 35-40 and 42 depend from claim 34. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by WIN for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Claims 45-50 depend from claim 44. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by WIN for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 44.

II. Claims 17 and 41 are patentable over WIN in view of COLEY under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 17 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WIN in view of COLEY. Applicants submit that claims 17 and 41 are patentable over WIN in view of COLEY under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 17 depends from claim 1. The disclosure of COLEY does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of WIN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over WIN and COLEY, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 41 depends from claim 34. The disclosure of COLEY does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of WIN set forth above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, claim 41 is patentable over WIN and COLEY, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Ji-Yong D. Chung/  
Ji-Yong D. Chung  
Registration No. 54,805

Date: March 20, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44987